

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KATALIN HORVATH,)	1:05-cv-00041-REC-TAG HC
)	
Petitioner,)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
)	SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED
v.)	FOR FAILING TO COMPLY WITH A
)	COURT ORDER
INS,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

Petitioner is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

On March 29, 2005, this Court ordered Respondent to show cause why the petition should not be granted within forty-five days of the order's date of service pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases.¹ On May 14, 2005, Respondent requested an extension of time of forty-five days to respond to the Court's order. (Doc. 22). On May 20, 2005, the Court granted Respondent's motion in part, giving Respondent an additional 20 days within which to respond, or

¹The Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases may be applied to petitions for writ of habeas corpus other than those brought under § 2254 at the Court's discretion. See, Rule 1 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. Civil Rule 81(a)(2) provides that the rules are "applicable to proceedings for . . . habeas corpus . . . to the extent that the practice in such proceedings is not set forth in statutes of the United States and has heretofore conformed to the practice of civil actions." Fed. R. Civ. P 81(a)(2).

1 until June 8, 2005. (Doc. 23). Respondent has never responded to the Court's order of March 29,
2 2005.

3 Local Rule 11-110 provides that "a failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Local
4 Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any and all
5 sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court."

6 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED within twenty (20) days of service of this order, to
7 SHOW CAUSE why appropriate sanctions should not be imposed for failing to obey a court order.

8
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 **Dated: June 16, 2005**
j6eb3d

/s/ Theresa A. Goldner
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE